

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel claims 4-5, 10-12, 40, 61, 122-123, 126, and 132-137.

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 124-125, and 127-131 stand pending in the current application.

With regard to the species election/restriction requirement, Applicants acknowledge the withdrawal of the election of species by the Examiner. (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 1.) Additionally, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's further consideration regarding enablement and duly note the withdrawal of the enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, made against claim 1-3 and 6-9. (Office Action, page 5.)

However, the specification stands objected to and claims 4, 5, 40, 61, and 124-137 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly lacking enablement. (Office Action, pages 3, 5, and 8, paragraph 5.) Applicants have rendered this rejection moot by amendment in part and respectfully traverse this rejection in part.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner initially wrote that the enablement rejection against claims 1-3 and 6-9 was reconsidered and withdrawn upon further consideration. (Office Action, page 5, lines 4-5.) Many of the claims in the subset of claims 126-137 ultimately depend on claims 1-3 and 6-9, which were found to be sufficiently enabled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims which depend on claims that have already been declared sufficiently enabled, are themselves enabled. Claim 126, for instance, depends on claim 1, claim 127 depends on claim 2, claim 128 depends on claim 3, and claim 131 depends on claim 1. Because claims 1-3 are all deemed enabled, claims 127-131 should also be